

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 14-27 are pending in the present application. In this amendment, claims 1 and 21 are amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Allowable Claims

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication of the allowable subject matter in claims 1-3, 5-7 and 14-17.

Objected Claims

Claims 20 and 21 are objected to as being allowable but depending from a rejected independent claim.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 18-19 and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hulkkonen, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0029587, hereinafter “Hulkkonen”) in view of Dalvie, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,062,270, hereinafter “Dalvie”) and further in view of Park, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,992,993, hereinafter “Park”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because the references of record fail to disclose or teach all the limitations of these claims.

Independent claim 18 provides a method performed by a mobile station and recites: when selecting a mobile network to access, checking whether the selected mobile network and a corresponding access technology are not permitted for the mobile station to access by inquiring a list stored in the mobile station, the stored list identifying access technologies and mobile networks to which the mobile station is not allowed to access; and if the selected mobile network and corresponding access technology are not permitted for the mobile station, determining not to send a

location update request to a core network associated with the selected network; or if the selected network or the access technology is permitted for the mobile station to access, sending a location update request for access the selected network, the location update request being sent to the core network. It is respectfully submitted that the references of record, either individual or by any combination, fail to disclose or suggest all limitations of claim 18.

In rejecting limitations of claim 18 associated with a list stored in a mobile station identifying access technologies and mobile networks to which the mobile station is not allowed to access, the Office Action argued by referring to paragraphs [0043], [0045] and [0051]-[0052] that Hulkkonen discloses a list of **allowed target radio access networks** that has stored for each of several user equipments **identification of all radio access networks** based on the agreement between the network providers (*See* Office Action, page 3, emphasis added).

As clearly recited in claim 18, (1) the list stored in the mobile station identifies **not only the mobile networks but also access technologies**, and (2) both the identified mobile networks and access technologies listed are **not allowed** for the mobile station to access. In contrast, as the Office Action already pointed out, the alleged Hulkkonen's list merely identifies **all access networks, but does not identify any access technologies**, and the identified access networks are those that are **allowed** (*i.e.*, opposite not allowed) for a user equipment to be handed over (*See*, *e.g.*, paragraphs [0043], [0045], [0051]-[0052], which are also referenced by the Office Action). As stated by Hulkkonen,

The invention relates to a method for supporting a handover of a user equipment (15) from a first radio access network (11) to a second radio access network (13). In order to ensure the success of the handover, it is proposed that a core network stores at least for some user equipment (15) a list identifying all **radio access networks**, (11, 13) to which the respective user equipment (15) is **allowed** to be hander over. . . .

The MSC/VLR 23, in contrast, comprises storing means into which the operator has stored a list for each of several user equipments, ... The respective list includes MCC/MNC pairs which identify all **radio access networks** to which the respective user equipment **can be handed over** according to the agreement between the network operator and the MVNO. . . .

In order to be able to provide lists of allowed target radio access networks to a circuit switched GSM radio access network, such lists should be stored again in an MSC/VLR,

Hulkkonen, Abstract and ¶¶ [0043] & [0051] (emphasis added). From the cited paragraphs and many other sections of Hulkkonen (*e.g.*, paragraphs [0045], [0053]), it can be seen clearly that Hulkkonen's stored list at best identifies all **radio access networks** that a user equipment is **permitted** to be handed over, but does **not** identify **any access technologies** which are **not allowed** for the mobile station. However, as discussed above, in claim 18, (1) the list identifies **not only the mobile networks but also access technologies** and (2) both the identified mobile networks and access technologies are **not allowed** for the mobile station to access. Thus, Hulkkonen's list is different and even teaches away from the recited list of claim 18 and claims depending therefrom, and cannot properly support a rejection of these claims.

Dalvie does not cure the deficiencies in Hulkkonen because Dalvie's list is at best of restricted location areas for the home network operator (*See, e.g.*, col. 3, lines 19-22, 69-67 and FIG. 3), however, Dalvie's list does **not** identify both access technologies and mobile networks which are not allowed for a mobile station as recited by claim 18.

Newly cited reference Park also does not make up for the above deficiencies in Hulkkonen and Dalvies because Park does not at all disclose a list (stored in a mobile station) that identifies both access technologies and mobile networks which are not allowed for a mobile station to access. As for the PLMN ID stored in a mobile station which is pointed in the Office Action, as the Office Action stated, the alleged PLMN ID at best indicates the network that

allowed the mobile station access, but the alleged PLMN ID does not include or identify both access technologies and mobile networks that a mobile station is not allowed to access at all.

Therefore, the combination of the references fails to disclose at least the above elements of independent claim 18, and consequently fails to render obvious claim 18. As such, claim 18 is patentable over the references of record. Claims 19-23 depend from claim 18 and add additional limitations, and thus, are allowable as well.

Independent claim 24 is directed to a system which comprises a mobile station communicatively connected with a mobile network, wherein the mobile station comprises a first unit configured to store a list identifying mobile network networks and access technologies to which the mobile station is not permitted to access; a second unit configured to check, when the mobile station selects a PLMN network to access via an access technology, whether the selected network and the corresponding access technology are not permitted for the mobile station to access by inquiring the list; and a third unit configured to determine not to send a request for access the access network to a core network if the selected network or the access technology is not permitted for the mobile station to access, or configured to send a request to the core network in order to access the selected network if the selected network or the access technology is permitted for the mobile station to access.

As can be seen, claim 24 also recites a list identifying both mobile network networks and access technologies to which the mobile station is not permitted to access similar to that of claim 18 discussed above. Therefore, for at least the reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 18, claim 24 is allowable over the references of record.

Claims 25-27 depend from claim 24 and add further limitations, and therefore, are allowable over the references of record in view of their dependence on an allowable claim as well as the additional limitations.

Conclusion

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicant's Attorney, Brian A. Carlson, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

September 27, 2010
Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218

/Brian A. Carlson/
Brian A. Carlson
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 37,793